

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/647,080	ARNOUSE, MICHAEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kambiz Zand	2132	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kambiz Zand. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. William Lang. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 15 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 56 and 57.


Identification of prior art discussed: Ono.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that incorporation of the claim 57 into claim 56 and added limitation of "identification card"; hardware", "pin code" and other limitations (see the enclosed office action) would overcome the prior art of Ono. It was further agreed that such amendments be done by examiner amendments adding new claims 58-62 and charge the appropriate fee to the applicant's account. It was further agreed that if the final search do not disclose any reference that reads on applicant's claim invention, the application would be allowed..